DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 486 52 LI 000 366

AMERICAN STATE LIBRARIES AND STATE LIBRARY AGENCIES: AN OVERVIEW WITH RECOMMENDATIONS. A REPORT PREPARED FOR THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES.

National Advisory Commission on Libraries, Washington, D.C.; Nelson Associates, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-7-0961
Pub Date Nov 67
Contract-OEC-2-7-010105-1523
Note-37p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.56
Descriptors-*EVALUATION, FINANCIAL SUPPORT, GOVERNMENT ROLE, LIBRARY COOPERATION, *LIBRARY PROGRAMS, LIBRARY RESEARCH, LIBRARY SERVICES, LIBRARY STANDARDS, *STATE FEDERAL SUPPORT, *STATE LIBRARIES
Identifiers-*Library Services and Construction Act, LSCA

This assessment of state libraries and suggestions for development are based on conferences with an advisory committee, inquiries sent to state libraries, a literature review, and consultation with the staff of the Office of Education's Division of Library Services and American Library Association. It was found that state libraries play a key role in partnership between local communities, states, and the federal government for library improvement and coordination of services. However, the state libraries cannot adequately meet their responsibilities, none meet minimum A.L.A. standards, and they are held in low esteem by state governments. Limitations include: inadequate service to state governments, insufficient state support, unclear statutory authorization, rural orientation, little research, and a critical need for professional manpower. Recommendations, with many alternative approaches suggested, involve direct categorical aid to state libraries through titles added to the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), funds for research and development specialists and service to state government, addition of a title to LSCA for service to the disadvantaged, appropriations for library research and improved coordination, re-examination of state library responsibility, and strengthening the federal government library effort. Appended is the letter of inquiry, the states responding, and an 86-item bibliography. (JB)

BR-7-0961
P.A.-52
LI 000 866
ERIC/CLIS

AMERICAN STATE LIBRARIES AND STATE LIBRARY AGENCIES: AN OVERVIEW WITH RECOMMENDATIONS

ED022486

NELSON ASSOCIATES, INCORPORATED

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AMERICAN STATE LIBRARIES AND STATE LIBRARY AGENCIES: AN OVERVIEW WITH RECOMMENDATIONS

A Report Prepared for the National Advisory Commission on Libraries

Nelson Associates, Incorporated

November 1967

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS [redacted] MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY DR. MELVILLE J. RUGGLES TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE [redacted] OWNER."

This report is submitted solely for the information and benefit of the client to whom it is addressed.

The work reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

NELSON ASSOCIATES, INCORPORATED • 845 THIRD AVENUE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10022 • 212 HA 1-3110

November 15, 1967

Dr. Melville J. Ruggles, Executive Director
National Advisory Commission on Libraries
200 C Street, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20204

Dear Dr. Ruggles:

We are submitting herewith our final report on state libraries and state library agencies for the National Advisory Commission on Libraries. We are pleased to have been associated with the important undertaking in which the Commission is engaged and hope that the material contained in this document - along with our reports on public, school and undergraduate and junior college libraries - will enhance its present deliberations and, thereby, the cause of library and information service in the future.

Very truly yours,

NELSON ASSOCIATES, INC.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FOR THE STUDY OF STATE LIBRARIES

Emil W. Allen, Jr.
State Librarian
New Hampshire State Library

Ralph Blasingame, Jr.
Professor
Graduate School of Library Service
Rutgers, The State University

Miss Genevieve M. Casey
State Librarian (former)
Michigan State Library

Miss Jean L. Connor
Director
Library Development Division
The New York State Library

Mrs. Carma Leigh
State Librarian
California State Library

Miss Lucile Nix
Chief
Public Library Unit
Georgia State Department
of Education

Hannis S. Smith
Director of Libraries
Minnesota State Department
of Education

F. William Summers
State Librarian
Florida State Library

Nelson Associates wishes to acknowledge the guidance, assistance and encouragement that was so generously extended by the members of the Advisory Committee throughout the course of this study.

All of the members of the Advisory Committee have endorsed this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	INTRODUCTION	1
	Study Methods	1
	Report Format	2
Part I	ROLE OF THE STATE LIBRARY	3
Part II	ADEQUACY AND NEEDS OF STATE LIBRARIES	7
	Organization	8
	Structure Within State Government	9
	Statutory Authority	10
	Fiscal Support	11
Part III	SUMMARY	12
Part IV	RECOMMENDATIONS	14
Appendix A	LETTER OF INQUIRY	22
Appendix B	LIST OF RESPONDENTS TO NELSON ASSOCIATES' LETTER OF INQUIRY	24
Appendix C	SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	25

INTRODUCTION

This report concludes a study undertaken for the National Advisory Commission on Libraries in the summer of 1967 aimed at evaluating the role, status and needs of American state libraries and state library agencies. The scope of this survey did not extend to the conduct of original research. Rather, the objectives were to assess the recent history and current status of state libraries, to describe trends in their development, to identify problems they face and to consider possible future directions they might take. From the outset it was understood that this document should give particular attention to the outlining of alternative approaches to the solution of major problems identified. Accordingly, these alternatives have been placed within the framework of public policy in order to provide a basis for deliberation and choice by the Commission.

STUDY METHODS

The views presented in the remaining sections of this report grew out of:

1. Conferences with the Advisory Committee for the study of state libraries.

2. Impressions gained from a reading of responses to a letter sent to state library or state library agency officials in each of the 50 states and the four territories requesting them to identify trends in the development of their units, the major problem areas requiring attention and possible solutions in which the federal government might engage (see Appendix A). Answers were received from representatives of 33 states (see Appendix B).

3. A study of the literature on state libraries, especially The Library Functions of the States and Standards for Library Functions at the State Level as adopted by the Association of State Libraries of the American Library Association (see Appendix C).

4. Conferences with staff of the Division of Library Services, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and with the staff of the Washington Office of the American Library Association.

Throughout the study Miss Genevieve Casey and Mr. S. Gilbert Prentiss, former state librarians of Michigan and New York, respectively, provided wise counsel and advice.

REPORT FORMAT

The remainder of this report consists of four sections and several appendixes. Part I establishes the role of, and thereby defines, the "state library" and examines this ideal in terms of the practices of the states; in Part II, the major obstacles that confront state libraries in their efforts to meet the library service responsibilities of the states are reviewed; Part III summarizes the adequacy of the nation's state libraries, given the tasks that confront them; finally, Part IV presents suggestions for legislative alternatives aimed at improving the effectiveness of the comprehensive state library.

Part I

ROLE OF THE STATE LIBRARY

The role of the state in library functions has been defined as follows:

> "States provide library service directly, promote service through other agencies, coordinate the various library resources, aid libraries financially, and require service through Standards and Regulations."[1]

This report on state libraries rests squarely on a belief in the validity of this definition of the state's responsibility for library service.

The several states accept this responsibility with varying degrees of enthusiasm and commitment. Differences in the extent to which state governments acknowledge their role in providing adequate library services for all, partially account for the many dissimilarities in the manner in which each of the 50 states has chosen to execute its library functions. In a few instances, the state government has embodied the bulk of the responsibilities implicit in the above definition into a single, integrated governmental unit. More commonly, however, the states fragment their library services among several agencies of government. It is not uncommon, for example, to find the law library administered by the state supreme court, legislative reference by a legislative service bureau, history and archives by an historical commission, public libraries by a separate extension agency, school libraries by a department of public instruction, and institution libraries by correction or mental health departments. Under such circumstances, it is impossible to identify any one agency in each of the 50 states as the "State Library" and mean the same thing in even a majority of cases.

How, then, does one specify the dimensions of the state library? In this report, the term "state library" refers to that agency or group of coordinated agencies charged with the task of implementing the library functions of the state. In this view, that agency or combination of agencies is appropriately identified as the comprehensive state library.

Clearly, the role of the comprehensive state library is not very adequately simulated by collective references to the present activities of the 50 states' "State Libraries." Its role is best derived from the definition of the library functions of the state with which we began.

---

1 American Association of State Libraries. Surveys and Standards Committee. Standards for Library Functions at the State Level. American Library Association. Chicago, 1963.

Accordingly, the comprehensive state library provides:

1. Leadership in the development and coordination of all library resources and services within the state, including those in school, public, academic and special libraries and in the establishment of regional library networks which often will be part of existing and emerging national information systems.

2. Resources of statewide value, both for direct use by state government and as a backstop for local libraries of all types, in subject fields and to depths which have been predetermined by a careful appraisal of statewide needs and available library resources.

3. Special information services for state government officials, agencies and institutions.

4. Consultant and promotion services for those libraries which bring facilities close to readers, particularly public and school libraries, but including college, university, reference and research libraries.

5. Administration and regulation of state and federal categorical aid to local libraries, as well as aid for cooperative projects among libraries.

6. Administration of standards for libraries, certification of school and public librarians and workshops for the advancement of librarianship.

7. Programs for library trustees aimed at advancing the recognition and understanding of trustee responsibilities.

8. Research and planning leadership, including work with citizen groups, to stimulate steady improvement in statewide library resources and their utilization.

9. Leadership in establishing a body of state law congenial to the development of total library services of the highest calibre.

Since it is more difficult to capture the spirit of the comprehensive state library in a multi-agency environment, there is some temptation to believe that the library responsibilities of the state are best executed through a single, all-encompassing agency. And although there is not, admittedly, empirical data to support this contention, the weight of the circumstancial evidence is substantial. Nevertheless, the means are less important than the goals; if a state can meet the full measure of its responsibilities for adequate, coordinated library services with several agencies working

cooperatively, then it is doing no less than it might accomplish through a single governmental unit.[2]

However effected, coordination between various types of libraries within a state - public, school, academic and special - and coordination of each state's library resources with those in surrounding states and with libraries at the national level becomes an increasingly important role of the state library as the informational needs of people become more complex and published resources become more voluminous. Furthermore, as information networks proliferate outside library auspices - such as statewide educational television systems, inter-university computer networks and technical information facilities such as the Educational Research Information Center (ERIC) - the state library is faced with a new dimension of coordination. It is important that the resources in libraries and the professional competence of librarians in the intellectual organization of materials be utilized in the electronic systems being developed, and that the wealth of precise information available through these networks be opened to all citizens who need it. Finally, economy and efficiency require that compatibility be built into the various information systems being developed on a state, regional and national level. Although the latter is essentially a problem for the federal government, each state library must put its own house in order and be prepared to cooperate with, and contribute to, nationwide networks.

Since the passage of the Library Services Act (LSA) in 1956, the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), greatly enlarged in 1964 and 1966, as well as Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 1966, state libraries have played an increasing role in the local-federal partnership for library services. Additional efforts at the federal level to improve all kinds of libraries will further underscore the necessity for effective planning and administration by the comprehensive state library.

In addition to acting as an intermediary between the federal government and local libraries by administering aid to public and school libraries, state libraries should also provide state government with reliable, timely and intelligently organized information. The importance of upgrading the quality of state government has been recognized by the present administration in Washington and by the Congress, as evidenced by the introduction of two pieces of legislation - the Public Service Education Act of 1967 and the Inter-governmental Manpower Act of 1967 - for which $35 million was recommended

---

2 For those states where the library functions are so scattered that there is no recognizable comprehensive state library, the recommendations in this report are understood to apply to that agency which has been designated by the governor or state attorney general to administer interlibrary cooperative projects under Title III of the Library Services and Construction Act.

in the 1968 Executive Budget.[3] The very fact that this legislation has been introduced underscores the serious need of state government for sophisticated information services. Unless state government has full access to needed resources, it cannot effectively serve its people or interpret their needs to the federal government.

With their many faceted responsibilities for service to state government, for administering the partnership between federal, state and local government in the improvement of libraries and for participating in the development and operation of information networks within a state and region, comprehensive state libraries are basic segments of a national plan for library and information services. It is appropriate, therefore, to determine how well equipped existing state libraries are and what should be done from the federal level to strengthen them.

---

3 The Public Service Education Act has as its goal to increase the number of qualified students who choose careers in government by means of fellowships, grants to universities for strengthening public service education programs and for research. The Inter-governmental Manpower Act is designed to deal specifically with the varied manpower needs of state and local government by means of fellowships and training programs.

Part II

ADEQUACY AND NEEDS OF STATE LIBRARIES

Cognizant of the responsibilities facing the state libraries, the Association of State Libraries of the American Library Association announced in 1960 a survey of these agencies, financed by the Carnegie Corporation. The findings, based upon detailed questionnaires and careful field work in every state during 1961-62, were summarized and commented upon in a volume published in 1966.[4]

This survey established the fact that the organizational patterns of state libraries differed widely from state to state, as did their level of competence. The areas which emerged as the most urgent for future attention were:[5]

1. Improvement of information services to state government, with emphasis upon staffing rather than more extensive resources.

2. Greatly enriched reference and research services in the entire state by a linking of present strong collections. ("Before, such a linking can be accomplished" say the researchers... "a staff must be recruited...with a considerable knowledge of specialized materials, bibliographical tools and the needs of higher specialized users.")

3. Access by the whole population of the state to a competent and professionally trained library staff. (The surveyors speculate that state-paid librarians, strategically located at major libraries, supported by superior bibliographical tools might make significant improvement in service without necessitating reorganization of library units.)

4. School, community and junior college libraries equipped with staff and materials appropriate to their educational programs.

5. Coordination and cooperation between all types of libraries, especially school and public libraries.

6. Plans for the adequate organization of service in metropolitan areas. This planning should be concerned not only with relationships between urban and suburban libraries, but also with non-governmental institutions and autonomous colleges and universities.

---

4 Monypenny, Phillip. The Library Functions of the States. American Library Association. Chicago, 1966.

5 Ibid. p. 52.

7. Service to the disadvantaged, including the blind, the partially sighted and patients, inmates and staff at therapeutic, protective and correctional institutions within the state.

The overall conclusion of Dr. Monypenny and his associates was that state libraries, in order to meet their present and anticipated responsibilities, require a level of staffing - both in size and quality - which far exceeds the present experience. "The most pervasive and subtle obstacle to the achievement of the stated purpose of state libraries is the shortage of staff," he writes. "This outweighs and is reflected in other obstacles - the inadequacy of public support, the existence of divisions within the ranks of librarians in a given state, executive or legislative indifference, limitations imposed by state and local revenue."[6]

This concern about increasing and improving staff in state libraries was underscored by nearly every state librarian queried in the course of the present study. To say that state libraries must greatly expand their staffs is of course to assume substantially increased revenues from some source.

Out of The Survey of Library Functions of the States, standards for state libraries were evolved and adopted by the American Library Association in 1963. These were conceived as <u>minimum</u> standards essential if state libraries were to meet obvious responsibilities. After the American Library Association and the U.S. Conference of Governors had adopted these minimum standards, each state library was asked to conduct a self-survey to measure its own performance. Not one state met all the standards. Even the larger and more advanced of the country's state libraries found themselves lacking in the important areas of service to state government; coordination of public, school, academic and special libraries; service to inmates and staff of correctional and mental institutions; development of centralized technical processing services; and, the collection, analysis and dissemination of pertinent library statistics. Salary levels for state library administrative staff, which frequently did not compare with those for positions of comparable responsibility elsewhere in the state, were cited as a major handicap to more effective state libraries.

The obstacles faced by the nation's state libraries in attempting to meet the library responsibilities of their states fall into four basic categories: organizational, structural, statutory and financial.

ORGANIZATION

Recognizing the diversity among the states in their provision for library functions, the American Library Association proposes these three standards for organization of state libraries:

---

6 Monypenny. op. cit., p. 164.

1. Every state should make administrative provision for the three broad areas of state library service - building and servicing of subject and reference resources, direct service to state government and consultation service over the state - and should have qualified personnel assigned to each.

2. The several agencies dealing with the three broad areas of state library responsibility should be unified as one department or division of government to the extent possible and advisable under state law and traditions.

3. To the extent that separate library agencies remain at the state level, they should be coordinated in a clear-cut plan which provides for consultation and cooperation and which specifies division of responsibility.

The degree to which any particular state endorses the comprehensive state library concept can be assessed by applying these three guidelines to the organizational pattern of the agency or agencies that have been assigned responsibilities for library services within its boundaries.

STRUCTURE WITHIN STATE GOVERNMENT

As state government becomes larger, more complex and more mechanized, it becomes attractive to reorganize into fewer, larger departments in order to effect economies by centralized purchasing, record keeping, data processing, etc., and to narrow and tighten the executive span of control. Since 1960, extensive study leading toward executive reorganization and/or constitutional revision was reported in California, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia and Wisconsin.

Being relatively small departments of state government, state libraries tend, inevitably, to be absorbed in reorganization into larger agencies. Although most state libraries still function as relatively independent agencies, there does seem to be a trend toward grouping them with departments of education.

If there is such a trend, it it desirable? To the extent that state government reorganization creates a department of education that has responsibility for the coordination of all levels of education, including higher education and adult education, then this department can be viewed as <u>one</u>

of the logical units within which to locate the comprehensive state library.[7] This point is somewhat academic, however, since the states do not appear to be moving toward more comprehensive departments of education. In fact, the movement is often in quite the opposite direction. Consequently, if there is a trend toward grouping state libraries with departments of education, these agencies are more likely to become identified with departments concerned only with public instruction, kindergarten through twelfth grade, and this jeopardizes the wider, coordinative mission of the state libraries. The important basic principle, then, is that the agency or agencies providing state library services should be so placed in the structure of state government that they have the authority and status that enables them to discharge the full scope of their responsibilities effectively.

In view of the continuing interest in state government reorganization, the question of the best position within the governmental structure for a comprehensive state library deserves a good deal of further study. Reaching objective positions is difficult, not only because of the diversity in the states themselves but also because, in practice, intelligent people of good will can work together within any organizational structure and transcend some of its limitations. Nevertheless, structure and organization can be decisive factors in a good state library program.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

The agency or agencies providing state library services should rest upon clear statutory provisions which define the functions to be performed, provide authority for these activities, and insure the legal basis for a flexible program to meet the needs of the state.

Because the idea, or perhaps one should say the ideal, of coordinating all library resources and services within the state into a single network or system is comparatively recent, many state libraries, whether general libraries or extension agencies, lack the statutory administrative framework to assume this leadership function. State libraries have traditionally worked in their extension activities principally with public libraries and to a lesser extent with school libraries. Consequently, most of these agencies need a firmer statutory base for coordinating all types of libraries in their states. It would not be inappropriate if the states were, in the future, to go even further by formulating coordinating councils that would encompass responsibility for the whole range of library and information services.

---

7 Even within a broadly conceived education department, a high degree of independence for library functions must be maintained to assure that library needs are not submerged by the pressing demands of schools and colleges. Alternatives to incorporation into a comprehensive department of education would include grouping the state library with a cultural affairs department or with an information processing agency.

FISCAL SUPPORT

Faulty structure, lack of statutory authority and inadequate support often form a vicious circle. On the other hand, no structural or legal base can guarantee that the state library will be provided with sufficient fiscal support to enable it to acquire personnel and resources of quality and quantity.

The critical personnel problem in state libraries - in 1965-66, state libraries reported a 16% professional vacancy rate, in comparison to a 10.2% average vacancy rate for all types of libraries of the country - relates very directly to a lack of state support, as does the common failure of state libraries to provide quality information services to state government, even minimal library service to inmates of institutions and really adequate backstopping of the library collections of the state. In the pilot gathering of statistics on state libraries, undertaken in September 1966 by the State Library Statistics Committee of the American Library Association, only twenty state libraries, out of thirty-five responding, reported that they had added over 10,000 volumes in the previous year. Most of the agencies reported collections in the 200,000 to 500,000 range, a slender resource to supplement the library collections of any state. Yet another indication of the lack of state support of state libraries is their inferior housing, often in rented, warehouse-type quarters.

There is ample evidence throughout the nation that while the federal programs have placed new burdens on state libraries, they frequently have not resulted in significant improvement of state support of the state library per se. State librarians are concerned about the increasing tendency on the part of state administrations and legislatures to let the federal government support the state library. It is regretable that such a large portion of the expenditures under LSCA Title I has had to go into strengthening state libraries themselves, rather than into the direct improvement of local public library systems.

Part III

S U M M A R Y

If one accepts the views detailed above - in particular, that state libraries play a key role in the partnership between local communities, the states and the federal government in the improvement of libraries and in the coordination of a wide variety of essential information services - then one must also face the fact that state libraries, on the whole, are not really adequate to their responsibilities. No state library in the nation fully meets the minimum standards adopted by the American Library Association. Although many state libraries have grown in competence and prestige since the Library Services Act was first passed in 1956, most of these agencies are still plagued by the following limitations:

1. Service to state government has not grown in proportion to the growth in public library extension services, which has been accelerated by categorical federal aid.

2. State support for local library service is, with few exceptions, pitifully inadequate. It is true that local support of public libraries has increased substantially since 1956, and there is evidence that the Library Services and Construction Act has stimulated increases in state aid to local public libraries and that it has resulted in the establishment of state aid in nine states. But whereas these increases in state aid to public libraries are often large percentage-wise, only a few states appropriate significant <u>per capita amounts</u> of state aid for public libraries. School libraries across the nation are, in turn, at a stage of development where public libraries were in 1956, striving not so much for excellence as for coverage. Community college libraries almost universally fall below standard. As inadequate as state support of all types of local libraries is, however, the lack of state support of state library agencies is even more striking and does not appear to have been influenced thus far by federal library legislation. Equitable means for stimulating states to assume the full measure of their financial responsibilities for library and information services need to be ascertained and implemented.

3. Clear statutory authorization for the coordination of all kinds of library service is lacking in many states. Official coordinating councils on library and information services, encompassing all types of libraries, do not exist in any state.

4. The rural orientation of most state libraries, reflecting the pre-reapportionment rural imbalance in state legislatures themselves, was intensified by the Library Services Act.

Despite the fact that the population restriction was removed from the Library Services and Construction Act in 1964, many state libraries do not yet work effectively with metropolitan libraries. One reason may be that the state libraries' weaknesses in personnel and resources have prevented these agencies from developing meaningful partnerships with urban libraries - whose interests frequently center on the middle class suburban reader - that would result in programs focusing on the problems of the inner-city resident.

5. State libraries generally are not conducting research into the library problems of their states and are simply not tooled to gather, interpret and disseminate statistics for all kinds of libraries with sufficient speed and depth. Finding reliable and meaningful library statistics, especially for other than public libraries, less than two years old is virtually impossible in most states.

6. An evident symptom, and at the same time a cause, of the above five problems is the critical lack, in both quantitative and qualitative terms, of professional manpower in state libraries. This condition reflects the general shortage in this country of competent manpower. It also stems, however, from low budgets and the non-competitive salary schedules prevalent in these agencies. According to salary data collected in June 1967, ten state librarians are paid less than $10,000 and only five receive over $18,000. Probably in no state is the salary of the state librarian on a level with that of the director of the principal public or academic library in the state.

7. Most state libraries fail to use modern communications technology, although the scope of their operation demands it.

In summary, state libraries too often are still low in the esteem of state government and low in the hierarchy of libraries within their state.

Part IV

RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to improve state libraries, the National Advisory Commission on Libraries might recommend one or several of the following alternatives for public policy. In general, these suggestions have been listed according to their relative priorities.

1. A title should be added to the Library Services and Construction Act to strengthen the state library agencies, somewhat in the pattern of ESEA Title V. This might provide to the states, distributed according to the formula used in LSCA, funds for such activities as:

   a. expanding the depth and range of state library collections to facilitate backstopping of local library services;

   b. providing program leadership;

   c. coordinating library planning on a statewide basis;

   d. conducting periodic and continuing evaluation of state and local library problems;

   e. collecting, processing, recording, analyzing, interpreting and reporting state and local library data;

   f. disseminating information on conditions, needs and the current status of libraries;

   g. publishing and distributing bibliographies and indexes;

   h. conducting studies or providing support for studies concerning the financing of libraries;

   i. providing local libraries with consultant and technical assistance; and,

   j. conducting workshops and other programs for librarians and library trustees.

The two years experience with ESEA Title V would seem to document that direct categorical aid to strengthen a state agency is productive. Most state education departments have, in fact, moved to evaluate their programs and activities, identify their strengths and weaknesses and establish

priorities for program improvement. It is significant that progress has been particularly evident in the strengthening of professional staff - the one area where state libraries are most in need of assistance.

As in Title V, the clear purpose of this title in the Library Services and Construction Act might be to secure more encouragement and support for the comprehensive state libraries from the state legislature and executive branch. Funds should be free for at least three years with strict provision for maintenance of effort by the states. The theory that categorical aid acts as a primer to state and local effort seems to be borne out in improved public library support and would suggest that a "Title V," Library Services and Construction Act, might also lead to improved support of state libraries by the states.

2. Deal directly with the staff problem by providing state libraries with funds for salary reimbursement for a position of research and development specialist, either on the state library staff or at a selected library school. Appropriations might be used for sabbaticals, further education, exchanges for key state library staff or for institutes at colleges and universities to upgrade state library staff. It should be pointed out, however, that such institutes could now be funded under Title II-B of the Higher Education Act.

3. Provide categorical aid to state libraries to coordinate and improve special information services to state government. This should be contingent on a state plan for the coordination and development of these services, should be a free grant for a period of about three years (with assurance of maintenance of effort by the states) and after this, be either on a matching basis or be phased out to the states completely. One argument for the latter alternative is that such information services will be broadly utilized by the people in state government only if the state government itself has a direct responsibility for the cost of these services.

   Strengthening state libraries generally with an LSCA Title V could also lead to improved services to state government, but the need for this service is so serious and so generally perceived that categorical aid seems justified. A plan for the development of services to state government might have the fringe benefit of integrating library services in those states where fragmentation remains a problem.

4. Add a Title I-A to the Library Services and Construction Act for library services to the disadvantaged. Libraries, like

other social agencies, have on the whole failed to organize the record of human civilization so as to make its values meaningful to the disadvantaged. State libraries should supply leadership by in-service training of librarians working in inner cities and rural Appalachias; by encouraging innovative programs; by channelling funds and ideas; and, by serving as catalysts to bring together community leaders, representatives from the group to be served, volunteers, persons from other disciplines (educators, social workers, clergy, etc.) and librarians to plan an all-out assault on this most urgent and difficult problem. Funds might be used for staff, materials, equipment and/or rent, and should channel to the large cities, the Appalachias, Ozarks and to the Indian, Eskimo, Mexican and migrant worker enclaves.

An alternative suggestion would be to encourage the use of LSCA Title I-A funds for library services in metropolitan areas with priority given to innovative projects to serve the disadvantaged, since LSCA Title III should be providing monies for the other major aspect of the metropolitan library problem - the sharing of research resources. However, this alternative might be too inflexible for easy administration and it would exclude assistance to the disadvantaged on Indian reservations, etc.

5. The riots of the summer of 1967 have taught us that the focal point of the social problems of the disadvantaged lies in the great cities - the 59 major metropolitan areas. An alternative to suggestion (4) would be to amend the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 to provide funds directly to large metropolitan libraries for innovative projects with the disadvantaged. There is some reason to believe that unless federal aid is direct, metropolitan libraries will not get the amounts they need to support programs of meaningful scope. The legislation might be flexible, with state libraries, metropolitan libraries and universities eligible to apply for grants. This would recognize the diversity within states and enable the best talent, wherever it is, to attend to this crucial need.

   If such legislation is attached to the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act rather than to the Library Services and Construction Act, grants should clear through state libraries to insure integration with the total state plan for library development. In the interest of coordination and economy, administration of such a library title should probably be transferred from Housing and Urban Development to the Division of Library Services of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Although emphasis in both alternatives (4) and (5) should be on action programs involving cooperation between the library, other agencies and lay personnel, funds should be provided to encourage wide dissemination of the insights and ideas that result from these efforts.

6. Research geared to practical action is urgently needed in several areas.

   a. What is the "fair share" formula - federal-state-local - to support libraries of all kinds? Some guesses have been made for public library service based on a formula first proposed to a Presidential Advisory Committee on Education by Carleton Joeckel in 1938. In 1948, with Amy Winslow, Joeckel proposed a formula for public library support of 60% local, 25% state and 15% federal. At an Allerton Park Institute in 1961, Hannis Smith proposed a support formula of 40% local, 40% state and 20% federal. In 1964, Lowell Martin proposed as a reasonable ratio 50% local, 30% state and 20% federal. All of these proposals are in striking contrast to the actual pattern of support in 1964, which was 81.8% local, 8.6% state, 2.1% federal and 7.5% from library fines and endowments.

   Of course, an investigation of a fair-share formula immediately leads to the thorny problem of equalization. But if the source of public library support is based on very slender investigation, the problem of a fair-share ratio for support of school, academic and state libraries has not been faced at all. There is, in addition, the very practical question of what proportion of the total public purse should be invested in each kind of library and in all libraries. In directing the agency charged with statewide planning for library development, state librarians need dependable guidelines. Indeed, the library profession itself requires more than educated guesses to impress legislative or congressional appropriation bodies.

   b. In the coordination of all library resources and services, what needs to be duplicated and what should be shared? Some guidelines based on solid investigation are urgently needed.

   c. Are there new ways to organize for integrated library service which overlook the traditional barriers between types of library - school, public, academic and special?

d. In the planning for library systems, does current technology suggest an organization of materials based on the subject boundaries of the library users' needs rather than along geographic boundaries?

e. Research is required to determine precisely what effect the provision of library service has on the well-being of the community. What is the appropriate role of the school, public, academic, research and/or special library in the community's endeavors to meet its informational requirements? Given a particular set of community characteristics, what kinds of programs for library service involving which types of libraries represent the soundest community investment?

Every state library is confronted with such long-range, serious questions. Most lack the funds to pursue any of them. Federal monies to add a research consultant to each state library as suggested in (2) might get the job started. Substantially increased appropriations for library research in Title II-B of the Higher Education Act would also be a channel. Research at the federal level by the Division of Library Services should be promoted since many of the required inquiries need to be coordinated at the federal level. At the very least, the Division of Library Services should be geared to collect and disseminate current library statistics on a national level, a capacity which seems to have been lost in the last reorganization of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

7. Every state has a book gap - a variation from nationally accepted standards - in all kinds of libraries. When budgets are tight, as they perennially are, the book funds are inevitably curtailed as the only substantial part of a library budget with flexibility. Substantial grants, based upon a coordinated plan, might be made to the states to close the book gap in state, public, school, academic and special libraries. Such action should encourage statewide planning and would represent an appealing supplement to Title III of LSCA, Title II of HEA and Title II of ESEA. It should have immediately felt results. Such a program might be free of matching provisions for about three years, then either put on a matching basis or phased out entirely. It would need to be safeguarded by stringent provision for maintenance of state and local effort. Funds should be included for staff and equipment to support the acquisition and processing of material as well as for its purchase. Unless a program of this nature is undertaken, the chance of closing the gap between the standards and reality seems remote.

8. One of the problems of the library profession which a "book gap program" would intensify is the question of the validity of the so-called "national standards" for materials in all kinds of libraries. Anyone who has tried to justify these standards to appropriating bodies knows how difficult they are to document. Furthermore, it is impossible to specify the kind and level of "gaps" - if any - that would exist if users actually had access to all the library resources in their area. The Commission might, therefore, underscore the need for scientific research into the nature and application of meaningful standards for assessing the adequacy of materials in all kinds and sizes of libraries in a particular region.

9. It must be emphasized that full authorized funding for LSCA Title III would probably do more to improve library service across the nation than any proliferation of titles as recommended in (7) above.

10. A simple alternative to most of the previous suggestions would be substantially increased appropriations in Title I and Title III of LSCA. Since many states are not themselves supporting state libraries adequately, however, it would at least appear desirable to limit to specific percentages the amounts of such increases which may be used by the states for administration of each of the titles, and to add categorical titles to LSCA to strengthen the state library and to strengthen information service to state government.

    At any rate, an intensive reexamination of the matching formulas used in LSCA seems in order, to make sure that proper provision is being made for reasonable state and local support of libraries.

11. Even strengthened state libraries will continue to face the problem of their legal and administrative structure within the state government. Because the state library is a vital link in the partnership between local, state and federal governments, research should be encouraged on the relationship of state libraries to departments of education and on the best organization for a state library within the framework of fewer and larger units of state government.

12. Since so many states are, or shortly will be, in the throes of constitutional revision and executive reorganization, research on a model statute for state libraries could serve a very useful purpose. The recently completed report on The Survey of Library Functions of the States and the <u>Standards for Library Functions at the State Level</u> would be invaluable source documents for such a study.

Although it has been argued that a model statute would be meaningless because states vary so radically in their organization and in the level of their development of library activities, research could be aimed at the development of several "models" for application to certain basic structures of state government organization.

13. To enable all state libraries to discharge their responsibility in the partnership between the state and the federal government, an up-to-the-hour index to all federal programs funding libraries should be maintained and disseminated, perhaps by the Division of Library Services of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

14. The Division of Library Services should be given capacity to provide leadership to the states, assist them in the full utilization of all relevant federal programs and to assure that library components are written into the regulations for the wide spectrum of federal legislation relating to health, education, welfare, technical information, etc.

    Furthermore, the scope of this agency's responsibilities should be broadened and strengthened to include experimentation in interstate, regional library projects. Some of the library problems of the states must be approached in a manner which necessitates interstate relations and agreements. Such large-scale programs for library service require and should receive planning attention and coordination at the national level.

15. The Library of Congress' automated cataloging program should be accelerated to include all books published. Plans should be developed for partnerships between the Library of Congress and state libraries - either singly or in regional c[illegible]na-tions - for the latter to receive catalog copy in machine readable form and to provide catalog cards or book form catalogs to all libraries of every type within the state. The cost of multiple cataloging of the same book, sometimes thousands of times across the nation, represents a waste of public funds which ought not to be tolerated.

16. Federal legislation providing grants to support library services should, to the extent feasible, unify such services and strengthen the position of state libraries as coordinators of all kinds of library programs within their states.

    The manner in which some federal legislation affecting libraries has been written has encouraged inefficiencies insofar as the designation of an administering agency was left entirely

to the individual states. Frequently this has resulted in further fragmentation of library services at the state level. For example, no provision was made for placing administration of ESEA Title II in any existing agency with responsibility for school libraries. Consequently, some states developed separate Title II units and now have two parallel agencies responsible for school library service.

17. Finally, since it is essential to the operations of the comprehensive state library that the federal government itself have a strong and well coordinated library effort, the National Advisory Commission on Libraries ought to take a strong stand on the need for a review of the organization and programs of agencies of the federal government engaged in providing library and information services.

Appendix A

LETTER OF INQUIRY

July 11, 1967

Dear:

The National Advisory Commission on Libraries established by President Johnson late in 1966 has engaged Nelson Associates to undertake a study of state libraries and state library agencies. This assignment will result in a paper designed to aid the Commission in preparing that part of its final report dealing with such institutions.

The purpose of this study is to assess the recent history and current status of state libraries, to describe trends in their development, to identify problems they face and to consider possible future directions they might take. Particular attention will be given to the development of alternative approaches to the solution of major problems uncovered in the course of the work. These alternatives will be placed in the framework of public policy to provide a basis for deliberation and choice by the Commission.

It is understood that our responsibility, because of limitations of time and money, does not entail original research. Rather, this assignment represents an attempt to bring informed judgment to bear upon existing knowledge and to identify significant themes, the most critical facts and the most compelling current issues. Since the object of the study is to provide counsel, our efforts will be directed towards clarity, perspective and succinctness.

To assist us in meeting the objectives of this task, an advisory committee has been appointed. The members of this committee, which will meet twice during the course of the study, are listed on the enclosure.

In addition to the guidance we receive from this group, however, we feel it would be highly beneficial to have any observations or suggestions you might wish to make in view of the fact that we are conducting the study outlined above. We invite your reply in whatever form, length and depth you consider appropriate.

The work of the National Advisory Commission can have important implications for library development in the future. Accordingly, we earnestly seek your cooperation and look forward to hearing from you. Because of the closeness of our timetable, we would appreciate having any responses you might wish to make no later than July 31.

Sincerely yours,

Charles A. Nelson

CAN/bmh

Appendix B

LIST OF RESPONDENTS TO NELSON ASSOCIATES' LETTER OF INQUIRY

Alabama

Alaska

California

Colorado

Florida

Georgia

Hawaii

Idaho

Indiana

Iowa

Kansas

Kentucky

Louisiana

Maryland

Massachusetts

Michigan

Minnesota

Mississippi

Missouri

Montana

Nevada

New Hampshire

New Jersey

New Mexico

New York

North Carolina

Ohio

Oregon

Pennsylvania

Vermont

Virgin Islands

Virginia

Washington

Appendix C

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adkinson, B. W.; Asheim, L. E.; Dix, W. S.; Greenaway, E.; Shera, Jesse; Whitenack, Carolyn I. "The Library of the Future: A WLB Symposium," Wilson Library Bulletin. 39 No. 3:228-243. (November, 1964).

2. Ake, Robert S.; Mathias, C. McC. Jr.; Ingram, Ada A. "The Library and the Legislature," Wilson Library Bulletin. 39 No. 4:315-324. (December, 1964).

3. American Association for State and Local History. Directory of Historical Societies and Agencies in the United States and Canada. The Association. Madison, Wisc., 1961.

4. American Association of State Libraries. Surveys and Standards Committee. Standards for Library Functions at the State Level. American Library Association. Chicago, 1963.

5. Atkins, H. D. "What is the Oklahoma State Library?" Oklahoma Librarian. 15:109-10. (October, 1965).

6. Bahmer, Robert H. "The Archival Function in the States," American Archivist. 22:203-09 (April, 1959).

7. Beach, Fred F. The Functions of State Departments of Education. U. S. Office of Education (Misc. Bulletin No. 12). Washington, D.C., 1950.

8. Beach, Fred F.; Dunbar, Ralph M.; Will, Robert F. The State and Publicly Supported Libraries: Structure and Control at the State Level. U. S. Office of Education (Misc. Bulletin No. 24). Washington, D. C., 1956.

9. Beach, Rex and Caton, John T. "State and Local Government Records Programs," American Archivist. 24:289-95 (July, 1961).

10. Blasingame, R. Jr. "Equalization of Opportunity." Library Journal. 90:2071-5 (May 1, 1965). (including commentaries by E. Greenaway, H. Hacker, R. R. McClarren and L. A. Martin).

11. Brahm, W. T. "The Myth of Federal Control," Library Journal. 90:2106 (May 1, 1965).

12. Bunge, C. A. "Statewide Library Surveys and Plans; Development of the Concept and Some Recent Patterns," Library Quarterly. 36:25-37 (January, 1966).

13. Bunge, C. A. "Statewide Public Library Surveys and Plans, 1944-64," ALA Bulletin. 59 No. 5:364-374 (May, 1965).

14. California State Library. Evaluation of the California State Library in Relation to Standards for Library Functions at the State Level. State of California. Sacramento, 1965.

15. Carl, Herbert A. (ed.) Statewide Long-Range Planning for Libraries; Report of Conference/September 19-22, 1965/Chicago, Illinois. U. S. Office of Education. Washington, D. C., 1966.

16. Carner, C. R. "Good State Libraries Equal Good Government," Commercial Law Journal. 69:247-8 (Spring, 1964).

17. Casey, G. M. "Michigan: Opening up Resources," Library Journal. 92:2523-2525 (July, 1967).

18. Connor, J. L. "Statewide Picture as Seen from the Library Extension Division," Bookmark. 25:207-10 (March, 1966).

19. Dalton, P. I. "Government and Libraries: Special Libraries and Statewide Plans for Library Service," Special Libraries. 57:589-91 (October, 1966).

20. Dalton, P. I. "The Responsibility of the State Library Agency Toward the Larger Unit," Library Trends. 13:328-41 (January, 1965).

21. Dalton, P. I. "Roles of Federal and State Funds in Library Development," California Librarian. 59:427-9 (Fall, 1964).

22. Dalton, P. I. "State Library Agencies in the United States," Libri. 15 No. 3:252-7 (1965).

23. Drennan, Henry, et al. "Federal Library Legislation, Programs, and Services," ALA Bulletin. February, 1966.

24. Ensley, R. F. "Seventh Annual Conference of Western State Library Agencies," Idaho Librarian. 17:144-8 (October, 1965).

25. Fixx, J. F. "Case of the Unknown Library " Saturday Review. 47:45-46 (April 11, 1964).

26. Gaver, M. V. "New Jersey Plan," ALA Bulletin. 60:1138-42 (December, 1966).

27. Goldstein, Harold. The Future Role of the New York State Library in Statewide Audio-Visual Activities: A Survey with Recommendations. (Occasional Papers, No. 70) University of Illinois, Graduate School of Library Science. Urbana, Illinois, 1964.

28. Haas, Warren J. "Statewide and Regional Reference Service," Library Trends. 12:405-12 (January, 1964).

29. Havlik, Robert. Survey of Special Libraries Serving State Governments, 1963-64. U. S. Office of Education. Washington, D. C., (no date).

30. Hawaii Governor's Committee on State Library Resources. State Library Services: A Report of the Committee, etc. State of Hawaii, Department of Education. Honolulu, 1965.

31. Hawaii Office of Library Services. Program Evaluation and Development. State of Hawaii. Honolulu, 1966.

32. Hazelton, R. A. "State Library Services to the Public Libraries in Maine," North Country Librarian. 8:90-2 (July, 1965).

33. Henke, Ester Mae. "Interlibrary Cooperation in Oklahoma," Wilson Library Bulletin. 40 No. 2:162-165 (October, 1965).

34. Humphry, J. A. and Humphry, J. Library Service in Delaware. 1966. (Available from Library Commission, State of Delaware).

35. Hunt, J. R. "System in Hawaii," ALA Bulletin. 60:1142-6 (December, 1966).

36. Jackley, M. A. "Organization and Functions of the South Dakota State Library Commission," South Dakota Library Bulletin. 51 No.3:92-116 (1965).

37. Jones, H. G. "The State Department of Archives and History," North Carolina Libraries. 19:5-15 (Winter, 1961).

38. Lancour, Harold, et al. Nebraska Libraries Face the Future: A Report of a Comprehensive Survey. Nebraska Library Development Committee. Lincoln, 1962.

39. Lee,C. E. "Bibliographic Cooperation at the State Level," California Librarian. 27:168-73 (July, 1966).

40. Legg, J. M. "Open-door Policy for State Libraries?" Library Journal. 92:207-9 (January 15, 1967).

41. Legislative Reference Services in the United States , a Symposium. (In New South Wales Parliament. Library Services to the Legislature, a Symposium. 1965. pp. 61-84).

42. Leigh, Carma R. "Interlibrary Cooperation in California," Wilson Library Bulletin. 40 No. 2:157-161 (October, 1965).

43. Leigh, Robert D. "Functions of the State Library in Research, Field Studies, and Surveys," ALA Bulletin. 53:25-30 (January, 1959).

44. Lester, H. L. "New Mexico State Library: A Six-year Analysis, 1959-65," New Mexico Library Bulletin. 35:320-2 (Spring, 1966).

45. Licklider, J. C. R. Libraries of the Future. MIT Press. Cambridge, Mass., 1965.

46. Long, Marie Ann. The State Library Consultant at Work. (Research Series, No. 6) Illinois State Library. Springfield, Ill., 1965.

47. Lorenz, J. G. "Uncle Sam and Public Libraries," (In Young, V. G. [ed.] Library Trustee, A Practical Guidebook. Bowker. 1964).

48. McKenzie, M. A. (ed.). Assembly on the Library Functions of the States, 1963. Proceedings of the Third Assembly. Library of Congress. Washington, D. C., 1964.

49. Mahar, Mary Helen. State Department of Education Responsibilities for School Libraries. U. S. Office of Education. (Misc. Bulletin No. 35). Washington, D. C., 1960.

50. Management Services Associates. A Survey of Texas Public Libraries, 1965. Management Services Associates. Austin, 1966.

51. Martin, Gene. "Interlibrary Cooperation in Missouri," Wilson Library Bulletin. 40 No. 2:166-171 (October, 1965).

52. Martin, Lowell A. and Bowler, Roberta. Public Library Service Equal to the Challenge of California: A Report to the State Librarian. California State Library. Sacramento, 1965.

53. Maryland State Department of Education. "Public and School Library Development in Maryland." Maryland School Bulletin. Vol.39, No. 2 (February, 1963).

54. Monypenny, P. The Library Functions of the States. American Library Association. Chicago, 1966.

55. Moon, E. E. "Where the Action Is," Library Journal. 92:1395 (April 1, 1967).

56. Marin, W. L. and Cohen, N. M. State Library Extension Services: A Survey of Resources and Activities of State Library Administrative Agencies, 1955-56. U. S. Office of Education (Misc. Bulletin No. 37). Washington, D. C., 1960.

57. Nelson Associates. The Ohio State Library: Present Operations and Future Opportunities. Nelson Associates, Inc. New York, 1967.

58. Nelson Associates. Reference and Research Library Needs in Michigan. Nelson Associates, Inc. New York, 1966.

59. Nelson Associates. A Reorganization Plan for the Pennsylvania State Library. Nelson Associates, Inc. New York, 1965.

60. Nelson Associates. New Directions for Library Service for Colorado: A Report of a Survey Undertaken for the Colorado State Library. Nelson Associates, Inc. New York, 1965.

61. Nelson Associates. Strengthening and Coordinating Reference and Research Library Resources in New York State. Nelson Associates, Inc. New York, 1963.

62. Nelson Associates. Suggested Guidelines for a Comprehensive Survey of Reference and Research Library Cooperation in Michigan. Nelson Associates, Inc. New York, 1965.

63. New Hampshire Governor's Committee for Better Libraries. Libraries Are For People: A Statewide Library Development Program for New Hampshire. Department of Government, University of New Hampshire (Governmental Series No. 12). January, 1963.

64. New Mexico State Library Commission. State Library Annual Report. 1965-1966. State of New Mexico. Santa Fe, 1966.

65. New York Commissioner's Committee on State Library Acquisitions Policy. An Acquisitions Policy for the New York State Library: Report of the Commissioner's Committee on State Library Acquisitions Policy. State of New York. Albany, 1965.

66. Posner, Ernst. American State Archives. University of Chicago Press. Chicago, 1964.

67. Prentiss, S. G. "Goals for State Library Service to State Agencies and State Institutions," ALA Bulletin. 61:387-92 (April, 1967).

68. Prentiss, S. G. The Scope and Responsibilities of the State Library Agency in Maryland. Maryland State Department of Education, Division of Library Extension. Baltimore, 1967.

69. Prentiss, S. G. "State Library Agency and Metropolitan Library Service," Library Journal. 92:546-9 (February 1, 1967).

70. "Provision of Services for Correctional and Other State-Supported Institutions: a Round-up of Present and Future Services," Association of Hospital and Institutional Libraries Quarterly. 6:11-19 (Spring, 1966).

71. Reinforcing the Role of States in Education. The second annual report of the Advisory Council on State Departments of Education. Office of Education. March, 1967.

72. Rohlf, Robert H. "A Plan for Public Library Development in Illinois," Illinois Libraries. March, 1964.

73. Savager, William W. Consultative Services to Local School Systems. Midwest Administrative Center, University of Chicago. Chicago, 1959.

74. Schell, M. E. "Acquisition, Handling and Servicing of Government Publications in State Libraries," Library Trends. 15:135-42, (July, 1966).

75. Schick, Frank L. (ed.) The Future of Library Service: Demographic Aspects and Implications. University of Illinois, Graduate School of Library Science. Urbana, Ill., 1962.

76. "State Dragging Heels on LSCA Title III Plans," Library Journal. 92:951 (March 1, 1967).

77. State Library Personnel Practices Committee, Personnel Administration Section, Library Administration Division, American Library Association. Personnel Practices in State Libraries and State Library Extension Agencies, 1960. Public and School Library Services Bureau, New Jersey State Department of Education. Trenton, 1961.

78. Stoffel, Lester L. "Public Library Development in Illinois," Library Journal. 92:210-13 (January 15, 1967).

79. Strout, Donald E. (ed.) The Impact of the Library Services Act: Progress and Potential. (Allerton Park Institute, No. 8) University of Illinois, Graduate School of Library Sciences. Urbana, Ill., 1962.

80. Texas Library Association. Skeletal Plan for State-Wide Library Development and Program of Work Recommended. The Association. Dallas, (no date).

81. Vosper, R. G. "Library Cooperation for Reference and Research: Introduction," ALA Bulletin. 60:1133-4 (December, 1966).

82. Wanger, M. M. Michigan Library Laws. Michigan State Library. Lansing, 1965.

83. Wisconsin Development Series. Public Library Facilities. State of Wisconsin, Department of Resource Development. Madison, 1965.

84. Wisconsin Free Library Commission. "Wisconsin's State Plan, a Restatement," Wisconsin Library Bulletin. 59:4-24 (January, 1963).

85. Winfrey, D. H. "Texas State Library: Its History and Service to the People of Texas," Texas Librarian. 28:12-22 (Spring, 1966).

86. "A Year's Realities; the States Report on Library Progress in 1964 and Compare the Realities with Last Year's Forecast," Library Journal. 90:56-71 (January 1, 1965).